

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>STEWART C. SMITH</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:09-CV-0889</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>OFFICER JOHN HANUSKA and</b>	:	
<b>DAVID BIXLER</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 21st day of June, 2011, upon consideration of the third motion for reconsideration (Doc. 123) filed by plaintiff Stewart C. Smith (“Smith”) on June 21, 2011, wherein Smith seeks reconsideration of this court’s June 6, 2011 Order (Doc. 116) denying Smith’s second motion for reconsideration as untimely and stating that the motion was merely an attempt to relitigate a “point of disagreement between the Court and the litigant,” Abu-Jamal v. Horn, No. Civ. A. 99-5089, 2001 WL 1609761, at \*9 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 18, 2001); see also Ogden v. Keystone Residence, 226 F. Supp. 2d 588, 606 (M.D. Pa. 2002), and it appearing that the purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to present newly discovered evidence or to correct manifest errors of law or fact, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985), that the court possesses inherent power to reconsider its orders “when it is consonant with justice to do so,” United States v. Jerry, 487 F.2d 600, 605 (3d Cir. 1973); Alea N. Am. Ins. Co. v. Salem Masonry Co. 301 F. App’x 119, 121 (3d Cir. 2008), and that a party may not invoke a motion for reconsideration as a

means to relitigate matters of disagreement with the court, see Abu-Jamal, 2001 WL 1609761, at \*9, and the court concluding that Smith has neither presented newly discovered evidence nor demonstrated that the June 6, 2011 Order (Doc. 116) contains a manifest error of law or fact, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The third motion for reconsideration (Doc. 123) is DENIED.
2. The court will not entertain any new motions for reconsideration regarding either, (a) the denial of Smith's motion for summary judgment, or (b) court orders denying reconsideration of the denial of Smith's motion for summary judgment.
3. Any motion for reconsideration filed by Smith, as described in the preceding paragraph, shall be stricken from the record.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge